

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to conform to applicants' election; embodiments directed to non-elected inventions no longer appear in the claims. Further, amendments have been made to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as further outlined below. More precise definitions of substituents have been inserted based on the description in the specification on pages 10-15.

No new matter has been added and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

The objection to claim 1 is mooted by the amendment which deletes the objected-to phrase.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, these will be taken in turn.

In paragraph a, claim 1 and claims dependent thereon were rejected because assertedly the phrase "non-interfering substituents" is not clear. This is directly addressed by amendment. The non-interfering substituents have been identified in detail. The "non-interfering substituents" that are substituted on Ar¹ are listed as described on pages 11-12, beginning at line 30 on page 11. The L¹ and L² linkers have been specified in the formula. R¹ is defined as those substituents listed on pages 12-13, beginning on line 27 of page 12. Ar² is specifically defined as set forth on page 6 and the R group attached to the specified rings is defined consistently with the substituents on Ar¹ as set forth on page 11, beginning at line 30. R³ is specifically defined as set forth on page 13, beginning at line 24. Thus, all of the "non-interfering substituents" have been defined structurally.

With respect to paragraph b, the term “spacer” has been replaced by “an alkylene” which renders this phrase clearly definite.

With respect to paragraph c, the nature of the isosteres has been specified as tetrazole, 1,2,3-triazole; 1,2,4-triazole, or imidazole as set forth in the specification on page 15.

With respect to paragraph d, the objected to phrase has been deleted from the claims and Ar^2 has been defined in terms of structure.

The rejection in paragraph e applied to claim 5 is mooted by cancellation of this claim.

Similarly, the objection in paragraph f with regard to claim 8 is mooted by its cancellation.

The concerns raised in the Examiner’s telephone conversation with the undersigned on 29 March 2006 have also been addressed. All of the structures introduced into claim 1 have now been underlined and are separated by commas. Although a “noninterfering substituent” in claim 10 was defined structurally at the end of the claim, in view of the Examiner’s objection, this definition has been inserted in lieu of “noninterfering substituent” wherever it occurs. In addition, “heteroforms thereof” has been deleted from this definition and in all claims where this appeared, has been replaced by “heteroalkyl” or “heteroaryl,” terms that have not been objected to.

Certain other informalities have been noted upon review of the claims. In claim 1, it has been noted that the “R” group that occurs in the structures by virtue of defining “H” is defined inconsistently from the “R” in subparagraph (b). Therefore, to distinguish these, the “R” group that occurs in the phrase “where an H is NCR” has been redefined as wherein “H is N or CRNO. Similarly, in claim 10, the “R” group shown as a substituent to the ring is inconsistently defined with the “R” group that occurs within the substituent. Therefore, the “R” group shown as a substituent has been designated RO.

In reviewing claim 10 more carefully, it appears that the substituent numbers are somewhat awkwardly defined and sometimes incorrectly. Clearly the intent was to allow the maximum number of substitutions in each case. By defining X^1 - X^3 the possible substituent(s) it is possible to simplify the claim wording.

In addition, because one of the "B" substituents in claim 10 can be absent in structures for IVa, IVb, Va and Vb, the possibility of nitrogen occurring at the position that is coupled to the remainder of the molecule has been specifically provisoed out of from the claim consistent with the unamended claim where one B represented L^1 .

The limitations of claim 60 have been inserted into claim 57 in response to the Examiner's request.

Claims 55-56 have been canceled as directed to a non-elected invention; however, it is believed that claim 57, which was withdrawn from consideration, may properly be rejoined as it is directed methods of use dependent on an allowable composition claim.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendment and remarks dispose of all the outstanding bases for rejection. In view of this, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims, claims 1, 6, 10, 16-20, 23-26, 28-30, 43-45, 47-49, 53 and 57 be passed to issue.

CONCLUSION

On all of the amendments above are formal in nature. It is believed that the claims now conform to the wording requested by the Office. If there are additional informalities noted by the Examiner, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket No. 219002029210.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2006

By: Kate H. Murashige
Kate H. Murashige
Registration No. 29,959
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5112
Facsimile: (858) 720-5125